

without knowing it' (p. 150). It is at this point one may confidently assert that *The Trick of Singularity* has lost all sense of direction, whether it knows it or not.

PETER J. SMITH *Nottingham Trent University*

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE. *Twelfth Night*. Edited by ROGER WARREN and STANLEY WELLS.

Pp. viii+248 (The Oxford Shakespeare). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994. Cloth, £42.50; paper, £4.99.

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Edited by PETER HOLLAND.

Pp. x+276 (The Oxford Shakespeare). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995. Cloth, £47.50; paper, £4.99.

Two more volumes in the Oxford Shakespeare, the twenty-first and twenty-second, bringing it that much nearer to completion, enjoy the excellent design and typography that puts this series ahead of its competitors. In other respects, though, it offers less than its main rivals, the New Cambridge and New Arden, which provide more comprehensive coverage of secondary criticism, and a more detailed account of the plays' sources, often reprinting generous selections. (Oxford belatedly follows their lead with Stephen Orgel's *The Winter's Tale*, 1996.)

Both volumes share another feature which has become increasingly noticeable in this series, a reorientation from the study to the stage. The *Twelfth Night* Preface records that Warren participated in the preparation of Peter Hall's 1991 production, benefiting from 'the detailed discussion of each phrase that took place during the rehearsals' (p. v), while Peter Holland begins his Preface by recounting his memories of Peter Hall's Stratford production in 1959 'when I was eight' (p. v). It is hard to know whether this reorientation derives from a feeling of dissatisfaction with the directions taken by recent Shakespeare criticism or from a belief that those working with Shakespeare in the theatre have more insight into the plays. Both reactions would be understandable, but it does not follow that either theatre critics or directors will necessarily illuminate the play. Some reviewers do so, such as Simon Gray noting the 'erotic ambiguity' in the exchanges between Viola and Olivia (p. 32), but others can be vapid or embarrassing, such as Alan Pryce-Jones on Max Adrian's Feste embodying 'the interplay of light and shadow which makes [the play] memorable' (p. 56), or J. C. Trewin emoting over Peggy Ashcroft's Viola (p. 64); and they can give contradictory accounts of the same performance (p. 25).

As for the directors, where previous editions have grouped accounts of their work under 'Stage History', these Oxford editors now bring them into the Introduction, and even into the footnotes *ad loc*, as if to show the reader how a particular scene ought to be played or visualized. I doubt if readers will benefit from knowing that at the 1980 Stratford (Ontario) production 'a mature Olivia threw herself at a young Viola only to be greeted by a strident comment from a woman in the audience, "That's really quite embarrassing"' (p. 34), or that Declan Donnellan's 1987 production first reintegrated Malvolio into society at the end of the play but then "'froze the stage [as] he came up in a blackout with the final line . . . It was quite chilling, because you felt he was biding his time"' (p. 68). Readers may wonder whether it helps their understanding and appreciation to know from the footnotes that 'in most performances' Maria's reference to 'th' buttery bar' (I. iii. 66) is taken to mean 'her breasts' (p. 97); or that after Feste had sung 'Come away death' one producer made Orsino give him not money but 'the song-book from which he had been singing' (p. 138); or that another glossed Olivia's reported dislike of the colour yellow by having Andrew Aguecheek dressed from head to foot in yellow (p. 152). These and other records of one-off theatrical

inventions (e.g. pp. 127, 137, 149, 170, 195, 198) hardly seem worth including in the annotation of the text.

Peter Holland's *Midsummer Night's Dream* continues the trend, regularly invoking contemporary productions of the play both in his Introduction and notes. The most frequently cited, as the index shows, is Peter Brook's celebrated version at Stratford (1970), in which Oberon and Robin sat on swings (p. 67), the sleeping Titania was suspended 'in a trapeze-hammock made of a massive scarlet feather' (p. 171), and Bottom's ass-head looked 'rather like Mickey-Mouse' (p. 183). Some readers may find these theatrical inventions illuminating, others simply perverse. Holland twice mentions (pp. 51, 131) the 1966 San Francisco production, in which Hippolyta (an Amazon, according to the sources), was brought on stage 'as a captive animal wearing black body make-up and a leopard-skin bikini in a bambo cage, her lines snarled with biting sarcasm'. (I can see why this sensational stroke might be mentioned in a stage history, but not what it is doing in a note on the character's name.) In this production the play scene ended when 'masked armed guards forced the workers back from the departing court', as the note tells us, incongruously enough, to the stage direction '*Bottom and Flute dance a bergamask, then exeunt*' (p. 251). It is hard to know what readers of the play are meant to do with the information that in Max Reinhardt's 1933 Oxford production 'Bottom and Quince had a running argument . . . over the pronunciation of the name' Thisbe (p. 149). Other bits of stage business devotedly preserved by the editor as glosses on the text (pp. 165, 194, 210, 227, 251, 256) merely distract the reader into reflecting on the exigencies of theatrical invention, such as having characters on stage fall over the supposedly invisible Oberon. If worth recording, such things would make much better sense in a section on stage history, where they could be compared with similar material, rather than alongside lexical and historical notes.

The strengths of both editions are their scholarly, lexical annotation. The *Twelfth Night* builds on *OED* and even identifies, in the index, entries which supplement the information given in *OED*. So the editors criticize as 'strained' *OED*'s suggestion that Antonio's worry lest 'I be *lapsed* in this place' (III. iii. 36) may be a transitive verb formed from the noun *lap* ('in the power of', hence 'apprehended'), accepting instead Keightley's 1864 emendation, 'latchèd', caught. They point out that 'amazed' (shocked) was 'a stronger term in Shakespeare's day than now' (p. 188), and note that 'competitors', in the sense of 'confederates, partners in crime', occurs more often in Shakespeare than the modern 'rivals' (p. 192). They give helpful glosses on legal phrases (pp. 95, 191), and for the scene of Malvolio's gulling (pp. 143–8) make good use of T. R. Henn's exposition of field sports terminology in *The Living Image* (1972). One interesting new suggestion concerns Feste's mock authority Quinapalus (I. v. 32); an English director of the play at the Comédie Française recently found that 'his French actor naturally pronounced the word "qui n'a pas lu"—"who has not read"' (p. 104). It is a pity that the editors did not devote the same attention to questions of style as they do to lexicography. The affected style with which Fabian spurs on Sir Andrew to challenge Viola (III. ii. 16–27) is described as being 'not like the utterance of a dramatic character, but like a set speech . . . Shakespeare is cranking the duel plot into action, and the effort shows' (p. 53). Then a bevy of theatre people are called on to testify that the long speeches throughout the duel scene 'create a major theatrical problem for directors', deriving partly from them finding Sir Toby 'incredibly prolix', and partly from its exposition of 'the rules of duelling, with which a modern audience is least familiar' (p. 54). More attention to the text would have shown that Fabian's speech is a pastiche or recreation of Toby's high-flown way of talking to Aguecheek, from their first appearance (I. iii. 117–25) to this scene (III. ii. 30–47). The editors make a few references to Shakespeare's conscious discrimination between verse and prose—although it seems to get

things back to front to talk of 'the constraint of prose' and 'the liberation of verse' (p. 40)—but they do not offer readers enough guidance on the differing functions Shakespeare gives to the rhymed couplet, as used by Viola, say (III. i. 155–60, III. iv. 364–7, V. i. 130–4), compared to Antonio (III. iv. 358–61). As for the verse itself, they almost only comment on it when the question of metrical regularity occurs (e.g. pp. 88, 115, 116). Rather disturbing for the general reader who might assume that this is wholly Shakespeare's play, they suggest at several points that the songs may not be by Shakespeare (pp. 70, 125, 137, 220, 222), but do not disclose whether they have any scholarly evidence for their doubts. In a valuable appendix (pp. 222–36) James Walker discusses the early settings of the songs, some of which he has re-edited for modern performance.

In annotating the text of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* Holland has scoured equally widely. For the name Demetrius he quotes a private suggestion of Elsie Duncan-Jones that Shakespeare recalled the silversmith of Ephesus who attacked St Paul and who, according to Acts 19: 24, made 'silver shrines for Diana' (p. 134), as moon-goddess an important presence in the play. St Paul occurs twice elsewhere in these notes, first in Wolfgang Franke's citation of Paul's 'Finally, brethren, farewell. Be perfect' (2 Cor. 13: 11) to gloss Bottom's parting words to his fellow actors: 'Take pains; be perfect. Adieu' (I. ii. 96); again for Bottom's reflection on the mystery of his dream ('The eye of man hath not heard, the ear of man hath not seen . . .') (IV. i. 207 ff.), a corruption of Paul's 'Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard . . . the things which God hath prepared for them that love him' (1 Cor. 2: 9–10). Holland adds the detail pointed out by T. B. Stroup that, whereas the Bishop's Bible translates the end of that passage as referring to 'the deep things of God', the Geneva Bible reads 'yea, the bottom of God's secrets'; yet he rebukes Stroup for 'over-emphatically' identifying this as the source of Bottom's name (p. 227). Holland himself observes with satisfaction that 'no one has yet proved convincingly that the word "bottom" could at this date refer to a person's behind' (p. 147), holding fast to the lexical sense of 'the core on which the weaver's skein of yarn was wound'. But at least he, unlike some over-serious New Historicists, does not shrink from accepting Thomas Clayton's persuasive case that the anatomical puns on 'stones' and 'hole' in the *Pyramus and Thisbe* play imply 'that Wall stands with his legs astride and the lovers talk between his legs', a comically awkward posture which encourages bawdy (p. 241).

In terms of the literary criticism that editors are supposed to provide, the volumes differ markedly. For *Twelfth Night* the editors' own literary-critical contributions are rather old-fashioned, whether in their attempt to evoke atmosphere, as in a passage on the play's 'elusive balance between . . . sweet and sour, laughter and tears' relating it to 'autumn . . . a season of contrasts: serene, warm days edged by chill nights, mists, and lengthening shadows. Keats catches precisely this quality . . . and so on' (pp. 7–8), or in their practice of traditional character criticism, with all its limitations. Although they quote some critics who have written acutely on the play's design (L. G. Salinger, for instance), they provide no awareness of Shakespeare having created and organized a complex structure, but write as if the characters were doing everything themselves. That is the normal illusion of drama, of course, but one of the critic's jobs is to go behind that illusion and show how the characters' hopes and desires are made to interlock and conflict in an overall design. Ignoring that task, Warren and Wells simply imagine characters in the psychologically realistic terms of nineteenth-century theatre, neglecting both their debts to Elizabethan theatrical conventions and their function in a plot structure. Orsino's 'personality', for instance, is taken as a thing in itself (pp. 26–7, 36); Antonio's motives for concealing from Sebastian his life as a pirate are discussed, 'the discrepancy [suggesting] that Antonio is not being wholly candid with Sebastian, though his basic integrity is not in doubt' (p. 41), as if the editors had access

to further, morally positive, information about him. They write in similarly specific psychological terms about the personalities of Sir Toby and Maria (p. 93), Malvolio (pp. 41, 43, 173), Antonio (p. 204: 'not the kind of man to be mealy-mouthed even when his life is in danger'), and Viola (p. 214).

At one point they write: 'It might seem too novelistic to suggest that Malvolio takes a short cut' on his errand to Viola, seeming to arrive rather suddenly (p. 120), but that is exactly the direction in which their critical approach leads. Predictably, such a realist orientation has difficulties with theatrical conventions. They explain that 'theatrical devices like disguise or mistaken identity are used in Shakespearian comedy to focus emotional realities' (p. 61), as if they had no other rationale in a plot. When they come to discuss the reunion between Viola and Sebastian, with all the 'corroborating detail' of identity tokens, obviously necessary given the characters' separation, they note approvingly that it has 'sometimes been cut' in the theatre, 'presumably to avoid laughter at its artificiality as a theatrical contrivance' (p. 65). As for the readiness with which Sebastian accepts Olivia's offer of marriage almost at first sight, they attempt to justify it in terms of novelistic realism by psychologizing Sebastian's reaction at IV. i. 18, where he gives money to Feste at his most obstructive in order to get rid of him, writing in a footnote that 'Sebastian shows both the generosity and the impulsiveness that characterize his sister: as the first meeting of Sebastian and Olivia approaches, Shakespeare takes care to suggest that the twins are temperamentally as well as physically alike, so that the marriage is not *simply* a matter of mistaken identity' (p. 189)—reading their own aesthetic concerns into the text. The same novelistic expectations make them welcome a director's invention of some business for Viola in V. i. (hiding against a side wall) which—at last!—gave plausibility to Sebastian's failure to see Viola for eighteen lines' (p. 211). In the present age, when critics vie with each other in being forward-looking, to ignore Elizabethan conventions in favour of realist expectations seems to deny the important historical insights gained in the 1930s by E. E. Stoll, M. C. Bradbrook, and others.

For *A Midsummer Night's Dream* Peter Holland has provided an enormously long Introduction (117 pages), which condenses a great deal of erudition, his own and other people's. It proceeds systematically, discussing in turn dreams (21 pages), fairies (24 pages), and then Theseus and Hippolyta, the lovers, Bottom, and Pyramus and Thisbe, returning to 'shapes'. Where Warren and Wells pay only brief attention to sources, Holland discusses the play's sources and analogues under each of these headings, and several times in the notes (pp. 142, 147, 152, 233, 239). But it would have been helpful to have some of the major texts reprinted here: few students will have access to Bullough's collection. The scholarly level is high, with only a few errors noted (p. 7: Lynn Thorndike was not a she; p. 125: 'Bibliography'; p. 136 n. 54: 'vote' has been printed in bold face, as if it were part of the text, not part of the note; p. 183: 'pp. 000–00'). Dr Holland's treatment of other scholars is fair-minded, thorough, and (mostly) sensible; but he seems over-indulgent to Leonard Barkan's insistent reading of the plays in terms of metamorphosis (pp. 78, 86, 109).

Of the many areas of scholarship that Holland has mastered, he writes with especial authority on Elizabethan drama. He revives a suggestion made in 1968 by William Ringer that the pattern of stage appearances makes it practicable for the actors playing the four mechanics to double the four fairies, which would allow Shakespeare to achieve "an effect either of bulky grotesquerie or of something quite different" to the modern expectation of diminutive fairies, and he adds corroborating evidence from the droll of *The Merry Conceited Humours of Bottom the Weaver* (1661) which has just this doubling (p. 24). Holland rejects Robert Weimann's contorted, pseudo-historical argument that the diminishing belief in fairies made it finally possible to represent them in the public theatre,

pointing out that, with the exception of Greene's *James IV*, 'all the stage fairies were seen in court contexts' (p. 29). He provides helpful accounts of Elizabethan stage properties (pp. 151, 152, 177–8), and draws several illuminating parallels with the plays of Lyly.

Holland is receptive to so many critical approaches that one is surprised to find him vehemently rejecting any notion that *MND* may have been written for performance at an aristocratic wedding (pp. 106–7, 111–12 and notes, where reference is made to a 'full-scale demolition' forthcoming from G. J. Williams). Yet such a genesis—not, of course, incompatible with its performance in the public theatres—would explain an anomaly that Holland has noticed, the 'emphasis on fairy benevolence' which has brought Oberon and Titania to bless the wedding of Theseus and Hippolyta (II. i. 73), and which he describes as 'Shakespeare's invention', not found in other Elizabethan accounts of fairies (p. 34). That passage, together with Oberon's apotropaic blessing on the offspring of the three weddings ('Never mole, harelip, nor scar . . . Shall upon their children be', V. i. 400 ff.), has been well explained by Paul Olson in what is still to my mind an essay worth discussing ('*A Midsummer Night's Dream* and the Meaning of Court Marriage', *ELH* 24 (1957), 95–115). Holland never mentions Olson's essay (although a reference to it survives on p. 142), in strange contrast to the many other critics given such a generous welcome in these pages.

The breadth of Holland's acceptance, however, raises some problems. For a scholar who has so successfully recreated the appropriate historical contexts in the Elizabethan theatre he seems strangely unaware how anachronistic are many of the contemporary critical ideas he endorses. Discussing Hippolyta, Theseus' Amazon bride (according to Chaucer's *Knight's Tale*: in Plutarch she is called Antiopa), Holland writes a long passage on the Amazons as representing 'the threat of the self-sufficient women's kingdom . . . needing to be brought within the normal and "natural" constrictions of patriarchy', and constituting an 'inversion of gender hierarchy' (p. 50). We recognize the language of modern sexual politics, but none of this is in the play, as Holland is forced to admit (it 'has been resolved before [the play] begins', p. 50; Hippolyta constitutes 'an unrealized . . . opposition to the principles of male power that Theseus so completely embodies', p. 53). Even his excursus on the future child of Theseus and Hippolyta, the 'stereotypically gorgeous macho man' Hippolytos (pp. 58–9), seems a gratuitous gesture to some contemporary critical schools, unjustified by anything in the play. Friend to the feminists, Peter Holland pays his dues to the New Historicists also, by approving J. Goldberg's claim to find sexual-political significance in the fact that Hermia and Helen do not speak in Act V: 'the women will never speak', but "'return to Athens as bodies married, barred from discourse'", as the play "'marks, but does not necessarily condone, their place in patriarchal culture'" (p. 68). But the play does no such thing, and if it is always dangerous to read significance in silence it is especially so when we see how often in Shakespeare the boy actors playing women's roles are put into a subordinate position in large group scenes (often at the end of a play), such as the Pyramus and Thisbe play, in which thirteen actors take part. The dramatist does not distribute speaking roles in such scenes on a basis of democratic gender equality (to the puzzlement of many feminists), but bearing in mind the boy actors' lesser abilities, especially when immediately contrasted with the much stronger adult performers. One of the boy actors, playing Hippolyta, has a major role throughout this scene, as does Titania in the fairies' epilogue, but observing that fact cannot (of course) reconcile ideological critics to the play's failure to challenge patriarchal culture. Holland laments that Shakespeare does not write an ending more acceptable to modern political criticism: 'the lovers can only be reunited in the terms defined by Robin, a folkloric pattern that turns the women into animals [*sic*]: "Jack shall have Jill, | . . . The man shall have his mare again . . ." but the pattern of patriarchy has not altered' (p. 69). How could it? Why should it?

Holland brings contemporary expectations to bear in other ways which also distort his understanding of the play. He politicizes the Pyramus and Thisbe playlet from two directions, judging the reactions of the aristocratic spectators Lysander, Demetrius, and Theseus to show 'patrician arrogance' and 'an intellectual snobbishness that we are right to find distasteful', given 'our sympathies with the workers' (p. 68). Conversely, he sees their 'proletarian' drama as representing 'popular civic play forms, often suppressed by the state', and so having a political dimension: "'Pyramus and Thisbe" contains and controls the kind of social unrest that workers were demonstrating' (pp. 91–4). But this sop to neo-Marxist critics again imposes a modern reading for which there is no evidence in the play—it is hard to think of a happier group of men at work than these rude mechanicals. The most damaging of these anachronistic modern approaches is Freudian dream theory, which Holland frequently resorts to (pp. 1–4, 13–15, 95–6). For someone so up to date on other critical approaches it is strange that he should not have noticed the many books published over the last twenty years that have totally discredited Freud's theories and practice. (It may be sufficient to mention the work of Adolf Grünbaum, Frederick Crews, Ernest Gellner, Frank Sulloway, Richard Webster.) To talk in terms of 'a "manifest" level behind which lurks . . . the "latent dream"' (p. 1) is to adopt categories and terminology which are dubious in themselves and foreign to Renaissance texts. Although Holland gives a workmanlike account of classical and medieval dream literature, his interpretative allegiances are with the Freudians. He writes (p. 13) that 'It did not need Freud to identify the serpent of Hermia's dream as a phallic threat', obviously unaware how untrue that statement is, before giving us the full treatment:

the dream represents Hermia's careful disjunction of Lysander as phallic serpent from Lysander himself, who sits smiling and separate from the actions of his penis, thereby ensuring that the phallic threat from Lysander is dissociated from the 'person' Lysander to some extent. A Freudian reading of the dream would find in the object of the phallic attack, Hermia's breast and heart, a displacement from her vagina. (pp. 13–14)

(The reading goes on for another two pages.) But this is simply to impose our own (as it happens, discredited) theories on to Shakespeare's text, contradicting the principles of historical criticism which, in other ways, Holland practises perfectly capably. It is strange to find, on the same page of the notes, textual discussion, and citations from St Paul, Chaucer, and Florio, together with a quotation from the Freudian Charles Rycroft on how "'Intimates . . . tell each other their dreams . . . to enhance their self-conceptions by making each other witnesses of [emergent] aspects of themselves'" (p. 266), the editor evidently being unaware of the incongruity.

These unreflecting anachronistic approaches weaken what is in many ways a valuable edition. One other major failing, more a sin of omission than commission, is the absence of any commentary on the play's extraordinary range of verse forms, which Shakespeare links to levels of existence within the drama, and to crossing over between levels. Holland acknowledges the play's 'structural brilliance', citing the testimony of other critics, Nevil Coghill (p. 40) and G. K. Hunter (p. 100), to its many symmetries and parallelisms, and refers briefly to the way it balances 'aristocrats, workers, and fairies' (p. 98). But he gives no structural analyses of his own, and quite fails to observe Shakespeare's care in giving each group its own stylistic register. The adult fairies, Oberon and Titania, speak in blank verse and in decasyllabic couplets, Oberon delivering his magic charms in octosyllabic trochaics; the other fairies speak in decasyllabic couplets, and in rhymed short verse ('eight and six'); the noblemen speak in blank verse, and in prose during the play scene; the lovers speak in blank verse and in decasyllabic couplets; while the mechanicals belong in prose but put on,

for histrionic purposes, a range of verse forms as unexpected and as incompetently managed as their costumes and acting. When the two extremes of the play meet, in Titania's drug-induced wooing of Bottom wearing an ass's head (III. i. 107–91) each side stays in its natural medium, blank verse and couplets alongside prose and popular song. It is hard to know why Holland should ignore this astonishing demonstration of the interdependence of form and meaning. It would be strange if a critic otherwise sensitive should have a cloth ear. Perhaps his silence expresses the unease felt in some areas of current literary theory with what are dismissed as 'formalistic' issues. In this as in other respects he would be a child of his times: as far as many areas of Shakespeare study are concerned, hard times.

BRIAN VICKERS *ETH Zurich*

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE. *The Winter's Tale*. Edited by STEPHEN ORGEL. Pp. viii+296 (The Oxford Shakespeare). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996. Cloth, £40; paper, £3.99.

Stephen Orgel has followed his much-admired *Tempest* in this series with a valuable edition of *The Winter's Tale*. A comparison with the Arden edition by J. H. P. Pafford, published in 1963, reminds one how much the agenda of Shakespeare studies, and of Shakespeare editing, have changed in a generation. Professor Orgel's introduction discusses not only plot, character, and style, as Pafford did, but also contemporary ideas about art and art-collecting, about magic, and about marriage. There is a particularly useful account of the Jacobean political context within which the play was produced, which helps to counteract the impression—routinely given by critical discussion—that as a romance this play stands apart from the political pressures of the times. Indeed, one of the attractions of Professor Orgel's lucid and helpful Introduction is the way he links these issues, implicitly and explicitly, showing how one impinges upon another. His accounts of language and of motivation are particularly illuminating and level-headed. There is also a compact but efficient and nicely illustrated stage history, together with appendices reprinting Robert Greene's *Pandosto* and Simon Forman's account of an early performance.

When glossing the play's difficult language, Professor Orgel is usually more acute and precise than Pafford, and dispenses with many of his predecessor's linguistic and literary parallels. The former is definitely a virtue, though the latter is, I think, cause for some regret, as there is much in the Arden's undergrowth to prompt a scholarly interest in the play's linguistic world and to enable one to form a view of Shakespeare's engagement with the contemporary culture of proverb and commonplace: this is one way in which we come to appreciate Shakespeare's distinctiveness. One example of such a loss is the handling of the much-debated word 'Affection' at I. ii. 137, where Pafford accumulates many more linguistic parallels to help us understand the range of possible meanings. This is one respect in which editing has changed since Pafford's day: the Oxford series, like the New Cambridge and like Arden 3, is competing in the marketplace, and needs to be lean and efficient. It no longer attempts to provide what earlier editions of Shakespeare and the Oxford English Texts tried to offer, a substantial collection of materials for the scholar.

Perceptive though Professor Orgel is, in both his notes and his Introduction, about the peculiar language of *The Winter's Tale*, there are a few points where his modernization of the text and his glossing might be improved. Metre is difficult for many modern readers, particularly where stresses have shifted since the seventeenth century, and it would have been helpful to be told that 'July' (I. ii. 167) and 'mankind' (I. ii. 197) would have been stressed on their first syllable, but 'cuckolds' (I. ii. 189) on its second. Even allowing for the fact that Shakespeare is unusually free and inventive in his handling of the iambic